

2. Claims 26, 104, and 118 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,116,675 (Nash-Morgan). Claims 26 and 104 have been deleted, without prejudice. Claim 118 has been amended to now include the feature of a plurality of openings in the second section. This feature is neither claimed nor disclosed in the Nash-Morgan patent. Accordingly, claim 118 as amended is believed to be in condition for allowance and avoid the Nash-Morgan patent.
3. Claims 36 - 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,534,010 (Peterson). Claim 36 has been amended to include the feature of the second section having at least a first margin and a second margin. The first section being integral to the second section at the first margin and the third section being integral to the second section at the second margin. This feature is neither claimed nor shown in the Peterson reference. The Examiner notes a first margin and a second margin on the marked-up front page of the Peterson reference, however applicant respectfully observes that the first and second margins called out by the examiner are actually part of the first and third sections, respectively. This is unlike the present claim in which the feature of a first and second margin is part of the second section. The Peterson reference is unable to include margins on the second section due to the filamentous nature of the Peterson device. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that claim 36 as twice amended presents patentable material and avoids the Peterson reference.

- Claims 37 - 40, inclusive depend from amended claim 36, believed allowable, and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance.
4. Claims 32 and 105 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nash-Morgan. Claims 32 and 105 have been deleted, without prejudice.
 5. Claims 42, 47, 49, and 118 - 124 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson. Claims 42, 47, and 49, depend from twice amended claim 36, believed allowable over Peterson as discussed in paragraph 3, above, and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 118. Claim 118 includes the features noted with regard to claim 36, namely a second section having a first and second linear margin. As noted with regard to the rejection of claim 36, the device disclosed in the Peterson reference is unable to include this feature, since the second section of Peterson's device is filamentous in nature, rendering it incapable of including a linear margin. Accordingly, claim 118 is asserted to be in condition for allowance and avoid the Peterson reference. Claims 120 and 121 as amended, and claims 122 and 124 depend from claim 118, believed allowable and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 119 and 123 have been deleted, without prejudice.
 6. Claims 50 - 54, inclusive have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,234,462 (Pavletic). Claim 50 depends from twice amended claim 36, believed allowable over

Peterson, and as such is also believed to be in condition for allowance. The rejection of claims 51 - 54 is not understood since the Examiner also notes in both the Summary and paragraph 14 of the above referenced office action that claims 51 - 54 are allowed. Clarification is respectfully requested. However, since claims 51 - 54 depend from amended independent claim 35, believed allowable, claims 51 - 54 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

7. The Examiner notes that the indicated allowability of claims 36 - 40, 42, 47 - 50, 104 and 105 has been withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Nash-Morgan, as well as the new rejections in view of Peterson and Peterson in view of Pavletic. It is believed that claim 36 as twice amended now overcomes the referenced new rejections, and is in condition for allowance. Claims 37 - 40, inclusive, 42, and 47 - 50, inclusive depend from amended claim 36, believed allowable and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 104 and 105 have been deleted, without prejudice.
8. Claims 33 - 35, 44 - 46, 51 - 54 and 106 - 117 have been allowed. However as noted above in paragraph 6 regarding claims 51 - 54, inclusive, clarification is requested. Additionally, claim 43 is listed as allowed in the office action summary, but is not discussed in the detailed action. Claim 43 is believed to be in condition for allowance, however clarification is requested.
9. Claim 48 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, since claim 48 depends from amended claim 36, believed allowable, it is asserted that claim 48 as originally presented is also in condition for allowance.

10. Newly presented claim 125 presents the feature of the first section and the third section being laminated materials comprising a first layer and a second layer; the second layer including the first side. No new matter has been added. Since claim 125 depends from independent claim 118, believed to be in condition for allowance, claim 125 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objections and rejections be removed, that amended claims 36, 118, 120 and 121, and claims 33 - 35, 37 - 40, inclusive, 42 - 54, inclusive, 106 - 117, inclusive, 122 and 124 and newly presented claim 125, be passed to allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

By Laura A. Dable
Laura A. Dable, Reg. No. 46,436

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.
Post Office Box 26618
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226
(262) 783 - 1300
19 July, 2002

SOHN/8115.12394A-PCT US DIV 2020719 AMENDMENT E

Enclosures: Clean Version of Claims
Amendment Transmittal
Return postcard